UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,907	10/06/2003	David A. Broden	R11.12-0788	3794

27367 7590 07/01/2005

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400 - INTERNATIONAL CENTRE
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER	
ALLEN, ANDRE J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2855	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/679,907	BRODEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andre J. Allen	2855	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *13-24* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1-9-04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 13-24 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4-25-05.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-12 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/774867. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending Application No. 10/774867 teaches all the basic features of the claimed invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6 and 8-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Behm et (US 6055863).

Regarding claim 1 Behm et al teaches a body 14 having an opening adjacent to the first passageway 32 for receiving process fluid (col. 2 line 35) from the first passageway 32 when the process control instrument is attached to the flange 13 (col. 2 line 26); and a seal (col. 3 lines 1-10) adapted to be positionable against the flange 13 (col. 3 lines 10-20) to prevent process fluid from leaking past the flange 13, where the seal comprises a metal ring 48 positioned in the opening and coupled to the body, the metal ring configured to provide a metal to metal seal (col. 3 lines 9-10) with the metal flange surface to prevent leakage of process fluid therepast (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 2 Behm teaches the metal ring 48 includes a middle portion between its inner diameter and its outer diameter, wherein the middle portion is arched relative to a surface of the flange and the arch is curved in a direction away from the surface of the flange whereby high process fluid pressures flatten the arch portion in a direction against the surface of the flange (col. 3 lines 14-16)(col. 4 lines 40-50).

Regarding claim 3 Behm teaches the metal ring 48 includes a contact region 206 which is configured to contact the flange 13.

Regarding claim 4 Behm et al teaches wherein the contact region is curved (co. 4 lines 20-25).

Regarding claim 9 Behm et al teaches the ring iswelded to the body (col. 4 lines 13-18)

Regarding claims 10-12 Behm et al teaches the metal ring extends beyond a face of the body 14 when in an unloaded state, a sealing force (col. 3 lines 45-65)which couples the flange to the body causes deformation of the metal ring (col. 4 line 29-30) from the unloaded state and the deformation is a direction away from the surface of the flange 13.

Regarding claims 5-6 Behm et al teaches at least the contact region is coated with a ductable material wherein the ductable material 51 comprises nickel (fig. 4).

Regarding claim 8 Behmet al teaches the metal ring 48 forms a channel near its outer diameter, and further including sealing material extending along the channel (col. 4 lines 1-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim. 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behm et al (US 6055863) in view of Saenz et al (US 6539808).

Regarding claim 7 Behm et al teaches all the claimed features of the invention except a gasket along the metal ring. Saenz et al teaches a process control apparatus that includes a gasket (col. 3 lines 40-43). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art of fluid process control devices at the time the invention was made to modify the device taught by Behm et al to include a gasket incorporated with the seal structure as taught by Saenz for the purpose of ensuring a connection that would prevent leakage within the assembly causing damage (col. 3 lines 42-43 Saenz et al).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andre J. Allen whose telephone number is 571-272-2174. The examiner can normally be reached on mon-fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-2180. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

André Allen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2855

EDWARD LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800